



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,896	08/10/2006	David Laurent	101377-1P US	7620
44992 7590 01/06/2010 ASTRAZENECA R&D BOSTON 35 GATEHOUSE DRIVE WALTHAM, MA 02451-1215				
EXAMINER				
MABRY, JOHN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/06/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/597,896		LAURENT ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	JOHN MABRY		1625	

All Participants:

(1) JOHN MABRY.

(2) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 December 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 10:04 am

/John Mabry/
Examiner, Art Unit 1625

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
POTENTIAL ABANDONMENT FOR FAILURE TO RESPOND - Examiner called and left message with Stephen J. Sand (most recent corresponding attorney) to discuss if Applicant sent a Response to a Restriction Requirement mailed on June 26, 2009 - call was not returned. Examiner called and left message with another attorney of record, Carol Loeschorn and no call was returned. It has been over six months since restriction requirement was mailed and Applicant has not responded. Examiner reasonably concludes that Applicant intends to abandon Application 10/597,896, filed on August 10, 2006.